



LEVEL 1 - 51 OF 55 STORIES

Copyright (c) 1986 Educational Broadcasting and GWETA;
The MacNeil/Lehrer NewsHour

September 9, 1986, Tuesday Transcript #2857

LENGTH: 10214 words

HEADLINE: South Africa: Confronting Apartheid;
Holy War;
Campaign '85: Senate Sweepstakes;
Fumes at Work

BYLINE: In New York: CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT, Correspondent; In Washington: JIM LEHRER, Associate Editor; JUDY WOODRUFF, Correspondent; GUESTS: In Washington: Sen. ORRIN HATCH, Republican, Utah; Sen. FRANK LAUTENBERG, Democrat, New Jersey; ED ROLLINS, Political Consultant; KIRK O'DONNELL, Political Analyst; In New York: RAGHIDA DERGHAM, Middle East Magazine; REPORTS FROM NEWSHOUR
CORRESPONDENTS: JAMES ROBBINS (BBC), in South Africa; LEE HOCHBERG (KCTS), in Seattle

BODY:

Intro

JIM LEHRER: Good evening. In the headlines today, another American was kidnapped in Beirut. The Soviet U.N. official was indicted on espionage charges, and the American reporter jailed in Moscow expressed concern his case was escalating dangerously. We will have the details in the news summary in a moment. Charlayne Hunter-Gault is in New York tonight. Charlayne?

CHARLAYNE HUNTER-GAULT: The news summary tonight is followed by three focus segments. We find out about the kidnappers who call themselves Islamic Jihad and why they're striking now. We'll hear how a first visit to South Africa affected the views of two U.S. senators, followed by a documentary report on how South Africa is planning to get around new sanctions. And finally, a look at just what's at stake in upcoming U.S. elections.

News Summary

LEHRER: His name is Frank Herbert Reed. He is a 53 year old teacher from Malden, Massachusetts, who is the director of the elementary department of a small, private school in Beirut, Lebanon. This morning his car was stopped by gunmen, and he was taken prisoner. A radical Shi'ite Moslem group called the Islamic Jihad claimed responsibility for the action, as they have for the kidnapping of at least four other Americans believed to be held captive somewhere in Lebanon. In Washington, State Department spokesman Bernard Kalb said this:

BERNARD KALB, State Department: The U.S. embassy in Beirut is in touch with all who could be helpful in verifying Mr. Reed's whereabouts, and, if in fact he has been kidnapped, obtaining his safe release. Once again, I'll do what you're heard me do before and others have done before -- that we call on those who may be holding Mr. Reed, as well as the other foreign hostages in Lebanon, to release their captives immediately. We remind them further that we hold them responsible for the well being of their captives.

2022875251

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

LEHRER: There is also an apparent Lebanon connection to the bomb yesterday at the Paris post office that killed one person and injured 19. A group called Partisan of Right and Freedom left a statement in a mailbox in Beirut claiming responsibility for the bombing.

And the death toll in the Pan Am hijacking went up two more today. Pakistani officials said 20 people are now dead, and 31 others remain hospitalized in serious condition. Charlayne?

HUNTER-GAULT: A federal grand jury in New York today indicted 39 year old Soviet physicist Gennady Zakharov on espionage charges. U.S. Attorney General Edwin Meese, who announced the indictment in Washington, said Zakharov would be prosecuted vigorously. Zakharov, a United Nations employee, was charged with conspiracy, obtaining classified documents, and attempting to communicate material to a foreign government.

And in Moscow, the wife of jailed American reporter Nicholas Daniloff visited him for the third time today and said that he believes the espionage charges against him won't be resolved soon. Daniloff also said that he fears that U.S.-Soviet tensions over his case are escalating dangerously. In Washington, the White House briefed Congressional leaders on what steps it is considering if Daniloff is not freed. Late today, the Senate unanimously passed a resolution condemning Daniloff's arrest and warned that his continued detention could threaten U.S.-Soviet relations.

Sen. ROBERT DOLE, Majority Leader: I'm certain there are some Russian Rambos who think we've bluffing, who tell each other that the Americans are not going to risk the summit or trade, including sales of wheat, or the SALT agreement -- abiding by the SALT agreement -- or whatever it may be. They may be mistaken.

Sen. DANIEL P. MOYNIHAN (D) New York: The Soviets have got to understand that they can not do this and expect our relations to prosper in any way. They can not expect a summit meeting, they can not expect an arms control agreement, they can not expect subsidized wheat, and they can not expect expanded trade, they can not expect credits, they can not expect accommodation of the sort which we had hoped for -- which we do hope for -- if they persist in this foul and detestable, contemptible act of a police state in view of all the world.

HUNTER-GAULT: A spokesman for the Soviet foreign ministry told reporters today that a mutual solution to the Daniloff case could be found, but declined to be specific.

LEHRER: This was primary election day in nine states and the District of Columbia. The main attractions were mostly U.S. senate nominations that will set the players for the November general election, when the Republicans' majority control of the Senate goes on the line.

President Reagan used the day to talk about his new drug program with the leaders of Congress. White House spokesmen said the pitch was for a plan that will be formally unveiled Sunday in a nationally televised speech by President and Mrs. Reagan. The Senate Minority Leader Robert Byrd came out of a White House meeting with less than enthusiastic things to say.

Sen. ROBERT BYRD, Minority Leader: I came away with the impression that the administration doesn't have really any new far reaching proposals. I asked a

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875252



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

question as to how much the administration's proposals could cost, and the answer was something like a quarter of a billion dollars. It appears to me that's not going to begin to be enough.

LEHRER: A number of congressmen agree the President is not spending enough money on the drug war. A House coalition wants to spend \$700 million next year.

Rep. JIM WRIGHT, House Majority Leader: The bill will approach the job of mobilizing our forces to make an assault on illegal drugs in five separate ways simultaneously. First, to help with tools and equipment to eradicate supplies both abroad and here at home where they exist. Second, to interdict shipments coming into the United States more effectively. Third, better to enforce the laws that exist and some new laws that will help enforcement against laundering of money by drug dealers. Fourth, and probably here we get the biggest payoff of all, an education program. And then, finally, an effort to help rehabilitate those unfortunate individuals who have become addicted to this terrible menace.

LEHRER: Afterward, the Senate Republican leader weighed in with a new approach to pay for the war on drugs.

Sen. DOLE: One more thing we might do is to have a voluntary checkoff on your tax return. There's so much interest in the drug problem by people all across the country, we're looking at an optional tax checkoff that we believe would bring in millions and millions -- hundreds of millions of dollars a year. We certainly are working together. We don't -- we're not throwing any cold water on the House plan. We hope that we can finally get together.

HUNTER-GAULT: Under pressure from South African black leaders, Coretta Scott King today cancelled a meeting with that country's president, P. W. Botha. Anti-apartheid activists Alan Boesak and Winnie Mandela had criticized the meeting and said they would not meet with Mrs. King if it went forward. In a last minute cancellation of the Botha meeting, the widow of slain civil rights leader Martin King, Jr., said that she needed more time to acquire a better understanding of the complex problems in South Africa. Meanwhile, the South African government executed three black guerrillas convicted of murder. One had been found guilty of the December bombing at a shopping center near Durban in which five people were killed and 48 others wounded. The other two had been convicted of killing a suspected government informant. The men, members of the outlawed African National Congress, were hanged after refusing to seek clemency. Archbishop Desmond Tutu said he was surprised by the government's action.

Archbishop DESMOND TUTU: I would have thought that with our situation as tense as it is, a conciliatory move on the part of the government would do a great deal to create a climate that would make people a little more responsive to wanting to negotiate.

LEHRER: Also overseas today, Chile's President Augusto Pinochet declared war against Marxism. He said, "The war is going to start from our side." Pinochet spoke before attending the funeral of five bodyguards who died when his motorcade was attacked Sunday. Also, the editor of a magazine banned by the government was found dead today. He was taken from his home yesterday by unidentified men who claimed they were police officers. Police officials today denied involvement in the killing.

2022875253

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

And in Israel, officials said a summit meeting with Egyptian President Mubarak was cancelled. Mubarak and Israeli Prime Minister Shimon Peres were to meet this weekend. An Israeli spokesman said it was called off after a failure to settle a longstanding border dispute.

HUNTER-GAULT: And finally in the news, Delta Airlines agreed to acquire Western Airlines for \$860 million. If the merger goes through, Delta will become the second largest passenger carrier in the country.

Still ahead on the News Hour, who are the Islamic Jihad kidnappers, and why are they striking now? Two U.S. senators talk about how their first visit to South Africa affected their views. And we find out about the high stakes in the upcoming '86 elections.

South Africa: Confronting Apartheid

LEHRER: Now a Senate debate about South Africa. Not between two longtime experts on, frequent travellers to or noted cause leaders about South Africa, but between two United States senators from different poles of U.S. politics who just returned from their respective first visits to that strife-torn nation that has suddenly become so prominent in their worlds as United States senators. They are Senators Frank Lautenberg, Democrat of New Jersey; and Orrin Hatch, Republican of Utah.

First, gentlemen, let me establish before we get to the debating, establish where you stood on your views toward South Africa before you left. Senator Hatch, how about you? What was your view on sanctions? How did you vote, etc?

Sen. ORRIN HATCH (R) Utah: Well, of course, something has to be done about apartheid. It is a bad practice, and we all admit and agree with that. But I have not been for punitive sanctions, such as advocated by Senators Kennedy and Cranston and congresspeople in the House. But I did vote for the limited sanctions, the modest sanctions, for the purpose of sending a message and, of course, doing what we can do to prod the South African government into making the necessary reforms.

LEHRER: That's where your views were before you went. All right, Senator Lautenberg, how did you feel before you went?

Sen. FRANK LAUTENBERG, (D) New Jersey: Well, I went with somewhat of a bias, but I was willing to find out, see if what was being said was true. I voted for sanctions. I even voted for harsher sanctions. And I did it with --

LEHRER: For the Kennedy bill.

Sen. LAUTENBERG: For the Kennedy, for the Cranston proposal. And I would support harsher sanctions. And I did it with some considerable misgiving, I must tell you. I come from the corporate world. That was my experience before. And I know a lot of corporate leadership in the country, particularly in my state, where there are installations in South Africa. And they are good companies. These are companies that are very progressive, that have worked hard to advance the black individual working there and have contributed to schools and so forth. But after searching for another way to get this message across, which I think is essential for the United States at this point -- the moral message -- there was no other way. And I went to talk to people to see if

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875254



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

they had anything else to say.

LEHRER: All right, now let's -- both of you went. Who did you talk to, Senator Hatch?

Sen. HATCH: Well, I chatted with an awful lot of government leaders, from P. W. Botha to members of his party to the finance minister, the minister of education, to a number of progressive party leaders who, of course, have been fighting apartheid for a long time. I met with black leaders, I met with Chief Buthelezi, who is the chief minister of the Zulu tribe, the largest black group in all of South Africa -- 7 million of them that he presides over. I met with a number of black businesspeople, eight black union leaders, and very small businesspeople, and people who work for -- blacks who work for -- and Indians and coloreds -- who work for -- as they call them over there -- who work for the American companies. I also met with the people who monitor the Sullivan principles that American companies have subscribed to and learned quite a bit from them. I met with others as well.

LEHRER: All right. Now, who did you talk to, Senator Lautenberg?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: I met with quite a few people from the black community, including Bishop Tutu. I attended his last service as a bishop before he was installed as archbishop. I met with white businesspeople. There are no black businesspeople to speak of. I met with Dr. Motlana, who is a prominent physician who deals very much with the social issues concerning the Soweto community. I was in Soweto. I went to church where Tutu preached his last sermon. I was in Crossroads. I've talked to the ordinary people, the squatters. I've talked to people from business. I've talked to people from the university, from the Afrikaans University, Stellenbosch. I've talked to the president and director. I've talked to three eminent professors. I've talked to people who were in the progressive party who have resigned from the party because they felt the parliament was absolutely ineffective. I spoke to Helen Suzman, who has a long record of opposition of apartheid. I met with the defense minister, who was the only minister they could kind of squeak out for me to see. I wasn't particularly interested in meeting Mr. Botha, because I'd gotten his message very clearly from the South African embassy before we left.

LEHRER: All right. Now, what happened to your views, if anything -- Senator Hatch, to you first -- as a result of your visit?

Sen. HATCH: Well, I was amazed really at how little support there is for sanctions, and especially disinvestment, on the part of any black Africans, as well as all Africans -- whites, coloreds, Indians and blacks. As a matter of fact, I did meet with some black small businesspeople who do own their own businesses. There aren't very many. I have to admit that. And to a person, almost all of them were totally against any type of sanctions. They feel that the sanctions approach has been somewhat counterproductive. They kind of have been developing a siege mentality over there in the government, and even in the non-government circles -- that basically they think sanctions are going to come. They're taking the attitude, "It's us against the world." And what has really been a remarkable series of reforms -- not enough, but nevertheless significant reforms for the last number of years -- they've basically been coming to a halt. and it's a very serious problem. So I have real misgivings as to whether sanctions are going to be productive or counterproductive -- even moderate sanctions. But something has to be done. Apartheid is an evil practice. It

2022875255

LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®] LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®]



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

is something that has to be -- has to be pushed out.

LEHRER: Well, are your misgivings such, Senator, that if you had to vote again, you would not vote even for the limited sanctions that the Senate passed?

Sen. HATCH: Well, I do believe something has to be done, but I think to go beyond the limited, tailored sanctions that we have is a mistake. But I think what really needs to be done is I think -- you know, I had an amendment to the Senate sanctions bill that would double the amount of money to \$40 million that would really go to help with vocational education, with free trade unionism, with training black leaders and helping small businesspeople and helping them to grow and progress and to bring about positive change. And one of the things that I found over there, and it was significant to me, is that from P. W. Botha to the very liberal progressive party leaders, they basically said, "Look, we --

LEHRER: The white leaders?

Sen. HATCH: White leaders and black leaders. And black leaders. Buthelezi is totally opposed to apartheid -- Chief Buthelezi, the chief of the Zulu Indian -- the Zulu tribe, I should say -- but he doesn't want sanctions, because he feels blacks are the people who are going to be hurt. And what they said to me is they said, "Look, you Americans are treating this like an American civil rights controversy. This is very complex." It is complex. It isn't just like an American civil rights controversy. It's a lot more complex than that. And they said, "Look, what we need is we need positive assertions. Tell us what you would like us to do, so that we can at least points towards that, and we'll do something about it." Chief Buthelezi, for instance, convened an indaba -- an indaba of all the black leaders and other leaders throughout his area, his province. And what they did is they came up with a bill of rights that really is remarkable. He's talked about executive power sharing. And he's doing some very constructive things. They're almost completely ignored by the international media in their devotion to Bishop Tutu, Boesak and the African National Congress, which are the more radical sections of South Africa.

LEHRER: Senator Lautenberg, what did you find, if anything, that surprised you or caused you to change your views on things?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: Obviously, I differed with my distinguished colleague's view on things. I hardly spoke to a black person, including Bishop Tutu -- I'm talking about people in responsible positions of leadership -- who didn't cry out for sanctions -- cried out for something to make a difference. Yes, I met Buthelezi too, and he was opposed to sanctions. But there's a question about what his role is in this whole thing. And though he's purported to represent 6 million people in the Zulu tribe, there's a question of how deep his support is. He is a lovely gentleman. I didn't hear him offer any solutions. As a matter of fact, when I spoke to responsible businessmen, including the chairman and chief executive of Anglo American and other high level businesspeople, they said, "Well, we disapprove of sanctions." Then I'd say, "Well, what's the alternative? What do you offer?" There's nothing. Just silence. "Well, give this thing a chance to work out." And they talked, as Senator Hatch said, about the remarkable progress. All you have to do is look at how people are required to live. I don't care how successful a black person is; he goes back into that dungeon when his day's work is done.

2022875256

LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®] LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®]



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

LEHRER: Was that worse than you expected?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: Far worse.

LEHRER: Was it?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: Far worse. It's inhuman. It truly is. Where people are, if they live in a so-called house, it might be a two room house or a four room house. Whatever size it is, it's totally inadequate. No plumbing, with rare exception, no electric, no heat, no sanitation facilities. It's disgraceful. And I was with people who were willing to squat under the very nose of the administration, because they said, "They have to understand -- they the white government -- that we are going to stay here, and we're going to live here, and we're going to resist." And these are not vengeful nor violence-bent people.

LEHRER: Senator Hatch, how about you? You clearly must have had something in your mind, as we all would, as to what you expected to see about what the life of a black is in South Africa. How did it strike you?

Sen. HATCH: Well, I actually went into the worst war-torn part of all South Africa, according to them, and that was Alexandra. It was -- it was pathetic. It was a very -- they were very hard living conditions. We went out to Chief Buthelezi's region, and I differ with my good friend Frank Lautenberg, because he has done some very positive things. He not only presides over 7 million Zulus, but he did convene an indaba -- or a convention. He did bring these people together. He did come up with a bill of rights. He has made a suggestion on how to power share. He is a remarkable leader. But before him, since he's been against apartheid, before he was the most publicized man in many ways in South Africa, but when he came out against sanctions, he's been basically ignored, even though he probably represents the biggest constituency. Now, one thing I did find that was amazing to me is that I -- you know, I admire Bishop Tutu as a human being. He's humorous, he's articulate, he's bright. There are a lot of good things about him. But I found very little support -- constituent support -- for Bishop Tutu over there.

LEHRER: And --

Sen. HATCH: Let me just say this.

LEHRER: Sure.

Sen. HATCH: Bishop Tutu has an international media constituency, but he did not have among black religious leaders that we met with, among many other leaders throughout the country, he did not have the support within the country that the, I think, international press leaves the impression that he has.

LEHRER: Did you find that to be the case?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: No, not at all. Sure, there are some doubters. But basically, through the black community, Bishop Tutu, among other leaders -- it's not a monolithic community. There is no single person that has a command -- Buthelezi included. There's Mandela, respected, by the way, I must tell you, among many whites as well as the blacks -- a leader who is rotting in jail and doing the white cause more harm than good. The ANC will be driven to full communism if we continue our resistance to it. We had one of our ambassadors

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®



(c) 1986 EBC & GWEJA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

meet with these people. They want to make change. They want to make it at a reasonable pace. The white community is absolutely resisting any change. And if you saw the emergency rules that they have -- you can be arrested for now cause at all, not charged, withheld typically in solitary confinement. I have a newspaper here. It said, "Children jailed for public violence." The judge said these people are, for the purposes of sentencing, are first time offenders, and they sentenced 13 year olds to ten years in jail.

LEHRER: Finally, in a word, Senator Hatch, do you want to go back sometime?

Sen. HATCH: I think it's worthwhile for us to go back. I think if more members of Congress were to go back, they would realize how counterproductive these calls for punitive sanctions really are. And I think -- I think really we can do many more constructive things that would help there and get rid of apartheid.

LEHRER: Senator Lautenberg?

Sen. LAUTENBERG: I was totally depressed by the circumstance in which 22 million or 24 million blacks are asked to live. I don't want to go back to that country until there is positive change being made. Right now it's an animal house. These people are caged. They're kept under wraps, and it's not a place for us to be visiting.

LEHRER: Gentlemen, thank you both very much.

South Africa: Skirting Sanctions

HUNTER-GAULT: As politicians around the world debate what sanctions their governments should apply to South Africa, South Africans themselves are figuring out ways to get around any new sanctions that may be imposed. James Robbins of the BBC tells the story of these sanctions-busters.

JAMES ROBBINS (voice-over): The story of Armscor is becoming well known -- Armscor, the state arms corporation which reacted to the United Nations embargo on weapons sales to this country nine years ago by going it alone.

(clip from Armscor film)

Announcer: It's been a long, hard slog countering external pressures and a United Nations imposed arms embargo. And though much of what we use along our borders still comes from abroad, a great deal is now being manufactured or assembled locally.

ROBBINS (voice-over): And the story of Armscor is the best clue how South Africa means to beat wider trade sanctions. Before the 1977 arms embargo, South Africa was genuinely self-sufficient only in small arms and ammunition; reliant on the outside world. Now Armscor is a major weapons exporter. Research, adaptation of foreign product and secret deals overseas have pushed Armscor into the big league, now considered among the top ten arms producers in the world. State President P. W. Botha was proud to unveil a fighter to match Soviet aircraft in the region -- South Africa's update of the French Mirage, the Cheetah, a fierce, hybrid animal born of adversity, bearing its own message to the world.

2022875258

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

P. W. BOTHA, president, South Africa: The Cheetah demonstrates, once again, our response to the imposition of sanctions against us. If it is expected of us to forego other essential goods which we can not manufacture or build, let us obtain it by exploiting the self-interests of others.

ROBBINS (voice-over): Self-interest. Conventional businessmen know if they are forced to give up a deal under pressure of sanctions, someone else is always waiting to step in.

KEN OWEN, editor, Business Day: I do believe that we are going into an era of surreptitious trade, of smuggling, of dummy companies and false bills of lading, false certificates of origin. I think a great many people, and most of them crooked, are going to make an enormous amount of money out of it.

ROBBINS (voice-over): And they are the sanction-busters, trading in the shadow of international disapproval, secrecy their great protection. This little man works from home and reckons there are 100 others like him, buying and selling for clients worldwide, disguising the true origins of South Africa's exports, the true destination of her imports. This promises to be a booming, high tech, cottage industry. All you need: a computer linked to a telephone, a range of offshore bank accounts, and perhaps a map of the world.

South African trader: Traders are not politicians. Their job is to buy goods and supply goods to everybody's advantage. How else do we eat?

ROBBINS (voice-over): Working in favor of the sanction-busters, dozens of South African ports, large and small, scattered along 2,000 miles of coast. To most, a naval blockade is unthinkable. Add to that the hunger of shipping companies in recession saddled with massive over-capacity, and business -- any business -- is welcome. Shippers find it easy to cover their tracks. Cargos can be sold between nations several times while still at sea.

South African trader: Probably the goods would be sent to, let's say, the likes of Russia, Madeira, transshipped, put onto different vessels. Letterheads, invoices and so on would be prepared. A Mickey Mouse country of origin would be devised, and it's safe and away.

ROBBINS (voice-over): But working against the sanction-busters, some commodities hard to disguise, like coal. Laboratory analysis can quickly isolate its true country of origin. Last year's coal exports, 44 million tons -- almost a billion pounds in foreign exchange -- could be cut in half, threatening the jobs of 30,000 to 40,000 mine workers.

(on camera) Some boycotts will be hard to beat and will do South Africa real harm. But still, this country knows how Rhodesia weathered sanctions over 14 years -- as long as it enjoyed South African support. And now the Rhodesian experience can be put to work here. Pat Corbin was Ian Smith's big sanction-buster, now ready and waiting in Johannesburg, cynical about the choice of commodities targeted by the West.

PAT CORBIN, chamber of commerce: And there's a matter of trading advantages in the sanction business. You must question the reasons, particularly Australian and Canada. I mean, they aren't the front there, but they're going to benefit. But of course, they play very low key when they're trying to sell us wheat shipments. You probably understand that, don't you.

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

2022875259



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

ROBBINS: No, I don't.

Mr. CORBIN: Oh, yes. If they've got a cargo that they want to sell to us, they make perfectly sure that sanctions don't apply to that particular commodity.

ROBBINS (voice-over): The sanction-busters both enjoy and despise politics, believing their first law, supply and demand, will triumph in the end. A shadowy trader cites one of his recent deals: a shipment of South African sorghum seed for the Marxist government of Ethiopia, ravaged by famine, but ideologically dead set against such a trade. It was done like this: the money from a North American relief agency was laundered through Europe and sent to South Africa. The grain was shipped direct from the South African port of Durban, only the paperwork was doctored to make it look as though it came from Marxist Mozambique. Did the relief agency know what was going on? Of course, says the trader.

South African trader: They were aware of the truth, but they wanted to get this seed to Ethiopia, and therefore they went along with the slight bending of the rules. Most of them, thank God, are pragmatists and not politicians.

Mr. CORBIN: We will not have any difficulty at all. I have no doubt about that. And we will be able to select the origin of the goods, the type of the goods, exactly what we want. If one's got money, one can buy anything.

Holy War

HUNTER-GAULT: Terrorism and kidnappings continue to dominate the news today. Frank Reed, that American kidnapped in Beirut, was abducted as he was driving from his home in Moslem West Beirut to play golf. A group calling itself the Islamic Jihad or Holy War has claimed responsibility. Calling Reed a new agent for American intelligence, the group said he was arrested in West Beirut with documents that indict him. That brings to five the number of Americans believed held by the Islamic Jihad. The others include journalist Terry Anderson, American University Hospital director David Jacobsen, and American University agriculture dean, Thomas Sutherland. The Islamic Jihad has claimed that they executed a fifth American captive, diplomat William Buckley. The body has never been found. Today's kidnapping brings back into focus questions that we pursue now with a Middle East watcher. She is Raghida Dergham, a New York correspondent for the London-based Middle East magazine.

Raghida, just who is the Islamic Jihad?

RAGHIDA DERGHAM, Middle East Magazine: That is the question everybody is trying to answer. It is a shadowy organization, after all, and we don't know the identify of this Islamic Jihad organization. It could be sub-organizations, it could be front for other organizations. And it's widely associated with the Shi'ites of Lebanon, but it does not represent all the Shi'ites of Lebanon. There are other organizations, amongst which Amal is probably the most famous to you. Insofar as they do have a relationship with the Shi'ites of Lebanon, I'd like to point out a little bit -- a very short history of the fact that the Shi'ites had been underdogs in Lebanon, and they had suffered a lack of recognition. They looked for identify in other places, such as Iran, because they lacked it in Lebanon. They have -- a majority or a great number of the Shi'ites lived in Southern Lebanon, whereby they'd been exposed to consistent

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875260



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

Israeli raids, so they have suffered quite a lot. But having said that, the Islamic Jihad and such organizations are accused of several things, amongst which that in seeking Iranian identification, it is done at the expense of their Lebanese nationalism. They're also accused of having -- of seeking hegemony over the other groups in Lebanon. And Lebanon, as you know, is a number of minorities where, if one of the minorities seeks hegemony over the others, it is a non-starter to begin with, and it blocks any reconciliation.

HUNTER-GAULT: But basically they are associated with or tied to Iran?

Ms. DERGHAM: It is widely understood to be so. But since we don't know the exact identity of the organization, then, again, other possibilities exist. But it is widely assumed and understood that they are associated with Iran.

HUNTER-GAULT: And they are one group. I mean, we heard about Islamic Jihad last year and other times when there've been these kidnappings. Is there the sense that these are all the same or that there are various cells independently operating?

Ms. DERGHAM: Well, again, because we don't know enough, I can not answer this question. And perhaps especially, I don't know enough, but I also have heard the Islamic Jihad is not exclusive to Lebanon -- that there are other groups which have operated outside of Lebanon in the Islamic world which claimed association with Islamic Jihad.

HUNTER-GAULT: What seems to be their goal?

Ms. DERGHAM: Several, I suppose. I suppose you are asking me in terms of the particular kidnapping. They have identified the United States very much with Israel, due to the policies of the United States government on Middle East issues. So it could be that they are seeking attention. It could be that they are seeking revenge. It could be that, for example, there have been rumors that Israel has -- is planning another offensive in Lebanon. It could be so that -- to shift that tension. I really don't know the answer to the exact motive, but what I can understand is that they have grievances, and yet the expression of these grievances -- the way they're portraying it, in a way -- in many cases it has defied their own purposes.

HUNTER-GAULT: It's been more than a year since there's been any kind of kidnapping of an American citizen. Do you sense that there might be some connection between the recent terrorist incidents in Turkey and Pakistan, which is why this happened now? Or is it totally coincidental?

Ms. DERGHAM: Even the State Department -- I watched the briefing today -- and even the State Department has said that they don't know the identity of the people who have committed the Turkey incident and Pan Am. So I don't really know.

HUNTER-GAULT: It's not --

Ms. DERGHAM: I can not possibly speculate on that.

HUNTER-GAULT: I know you said that there were a number of groups and they were shadowy and so on, but is there any sense that inside Lebanon -- that in Lebanon, there is support for their actions, support for the group?

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875261



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

Ms. DERGHAM: Maybe there is support for some of the causes they stand for, when it comes to the Middle East issues. Some of them, for example, if it is the plight of the Lebanese themselves, for example, being tired of consistent Israeli raids or for the Palestinian issue itself, is that I think there is as much -- if there is association with them on these issues, there is also -- in general, the Lebanese are rather unhappy with this blanket attack against American cultural institutions -- academic institutions. I've heard many Lebanese -- the majority, I believe -- they object to this -- to the killing of American culture, academic institutions, because it defies the character of Lebanon.

HUNTER-GAULT: But what --

Ms. DERGHAM: Of Beirut, in particular.

HUNTER-GAULT: Excuse me. What about the Lebanese government? I mean, do they have any control at all or any role to play in moderating or --

Ms. DERGHAM: A role -- everybody could have a role. Everybody could contribute. But the Lebanese government, as you know, lacks authority these days. And there is many, many Shi'ites who are operating on their own. And there is an attempt, however, at reconciliation -- reforms, political reforms. Yes, in terms -- Lebanese, amongst themselves, must start to work this out, and they have to start first. But also what is needed is support and contribution from other regional and international powers, including the superpowers, for these efforts at reconciliation.

HUNTER-GAULT: I was about to say that, you know, in the past it's been said that Syria has a lot of authority in the region. What about powers like Syria, like Libya and so on? Do they have any authority, any role?

Ms. DERGHAM: I don't believe Libya has any political authority -- political, I said -- in Lebanon. But Syria, yes. Syria is closely associated with Lebanon, and it is trying. And it is the only player, in fact, on the political front that is trying to play a role in bringing the Lebanese parties together -- factions -- and trying to find a solution for the Lebanese internal problem. But then again, if you point out the Syrian element, again, there is -- the Lebanese themselves must cease to have these marriages of conveniences of several different points. So it is a contribution of the Lebanese which should be the paramount one in reaching anything for Lebanon.

HUNTER-GAULT: Just very briefly, since the U.S. seems to be such a target here, what is it that your sense is that they might be expecting from the United States now?

Ms. DERGHAM: Oh, they want -- I mean, I know what they would -- not only this particular group, but I know the majority of the Middle East; governments, people, organizations -- they want a different United States policy on the issues related to the Middle East. I mean, the United States is perceived as the godfather of Israel. Israel launches all its attacks and offenses with American weapons. So all the masses of the Middle East and governments would like to see a more sympathetic U.S. position towards their causes; not only an adoption of Israeli positions -- blanket adoption. So I don't know if this is the way that this is what they are trying to say to the United States or not. I don't know if they're trying, but there is a message to the United States

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875262



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

government. I don't know if this is the way to tell it.

HUNTER-GAULT: All right. Thank you, Raghida Dergham, for being with us.

Campaign '86: Senate Sweepstakes

LEHRER: Now to some talk about U.S. politics and what is at stake in this off-year year of U.S. Senate and other important contests. Judy Woodruff has more. Judy?

WOODRUFF: With this year's elections only nine weeks away, candidates across the country are already deeply engaged in their campaigns. The races getting most of the attention are those for the U.S. Senate, because of the possibility that Democrats could win back Senate control from the Republicans. To do so, Democrats would have to have a net gain of four seats.

{voice-over} Of the 34 Senate seats up this year, 22, or two thirds, are held by Republicans, leaving them heavily exposed. Among the most vulnerable is Senator Paula Hawkins of Florida, who is facing a stiff challenge from the current Democratic Governor Bob Graham. And in South Dakota, Republican Senator James Abdnor is lagging behind Democratic Congressman Tom Daschle, who is pressing hard on farm issues. Among the 12 Senate seats currently held by Democrats, there are also some vulnerable spots, particularly in those states where the Democrat incumbent is retiring. In Missouri, the race to replace Senator Thomas Eagleton is now leaning in favor of the former Republican Governor Kit Bond over Democratic Lieutenant Governor Harriet Woods. Meanwhile, in California, Democratic incumbent Alan Cranston is facing his toughest opponent in four elections -- Republican Congressman Ed Zschau.

{on camera} Senate Republicans who need his help can virtually all count on a visit from President Reagan. With some 18 political road trips already under his belt, most of them for Senate candidates, the President made an appearance this week in California for Congressman Zschau.

Pres. REAGAN: The election of Ed Zschau and control of the United States Senate is absolutely critical to the future of this country. If there was ever time for a maximum effort, that time is now.

WOODRUFF: On his way back from California yesterday, the President stopped in Colorado, where Republican Congressman Ken Kramer is in a dead heat with Democratic Congressman Tim Wirth in the race to fill the seat being vacated by Democratic Senator Gary Hart.

Pres. REAGAN: I didn't go to Washington to be a six year President. I didn't seek reelection just to protect the gains of the first term. There are too many exciting challenges still before America and too much business that still must be completed in these next two years. And I don't want my hands tied by a totally hostile Congress.

WOODRUFF: To help us look at some of these races and the rest of the political landscape this fall, we have joining us two veteran political observers. First, Ed Rollins, who managed President Reagan's reelection campaign in 1984 and is now a private Republican consultant. And Kirk O'Donnell, president of a Democratic think tank called the Center for National Policy. He was formerly the chief political adviser to House Speaker Tip O'Neill. Well,

2022875263

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

gentlemen, when the President talks about a totally hostile Congress, he's saying, that is, if the Senate goes Democratic, as the House is certain to go once again. What are the chances the Senate's going to go Democratic? Ed Rollins?

ED ROLLINS, political consultant: Well, I think it's certainly going to be a very difficult, uphill battle for the Republicans to hold control. If the election were held today, they'd probably have a one or two seat margin. But with eight or nine weeks to go and with so many incumbents to protect, they've got to win those open seats the Democrats have in order to maintain that control.

WOODRUFF: So you're saying if the election were held today, the Republicans would come out ahead, but --

Mr. ROLLINS: It would be very slim.

WOODRUFF: Kirk O'Donnell?

KIRK O'DONNELL, political analyst: Well I would say that if the election were held today, that the Democrats would probably come out ahead by a very slim margin.

WOODRUFF: What about on election day?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Well, I think it's a toss up.

WOODRUFF: What difference does it make if the Senate goes Democratic?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I think it makes a big difference in terms of setting the agenda. Namely, the Democratic Senate could set the agenda in the same way that the Democratic House does today. For example, the President talked about a hostile Congress, but he came back to Washington to meet with the leadership of the Democratic House, the bipartisan leadership from Congress. And the House was already moving on a bipartisan drug bill that's going to be considered tomorrow. So setting the agenda on issues like arms control would be very important.

WOODRUFF: How important is it that the Senate stay in Republican hands?

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, I think it's very, very important. I think, you know, first of all, Ronald Reagan is going to continue to try and set the agenda whether he has a Republican Senate or not. But I think it is very, very important to have allies in the Senate, to have the leadership of the committees, in order to try and move his agenda. If we had to deal only with the Democrats in the House and like-minded people in the Senate, I think the President would have had a great deal of difficulty in achieving some of the great successes that he's had over the last six years.

WOODRUFF: I'm asking, because there's at least one political analyst who's been quoted in the last week or so as saying that it doesn't really make all that much difference, because whoever's elected -- Republican or Democrat -- is going to be reflecting the views of the same constituents.

Mr. ROLLINS: Oh, I don't think that's true at all. I think those committee chairmanships are so very, very important. You know, you can just imagine the

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875264



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

President trying to get through the Supreme Court nominations with Senator Kennedy from Massachusetts being the chairman. It would be very, very difficult. And I just think it's just crucial for us to hold that Senate.

WOODRUFF: Let's talk about some of the important races. Kirk O'Donnell, where would you say the Republicans -- which seats would you say the Republicans have the most to worry about in the Senate?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Well, I would agree with your assessment of the two seats in terms of Florida and South Dakota. I think they have to worry about North Carolina. They have to worry about Nevada. They have to worry about an open seat in Maryland. They have to worry about Idaho. I think Oklahoma and Georgia are looking much better for the Democrats these days.

WOODRUFF: Would you buy that list?

Mr. ROLLINS: I would buy that and maybe add one or two more. But I do want to state this: as of today, in any polls -- public polls or private polls -- the two incumbents that you mentioned are trailing. Both are very strong candidates and, I think, can come back. The three open seats on the Democratic side -- Missouri, Colorado, Louisiana -- are crucial to the Republicans holding the Senate. Today, I would say we're ahead in two -- close margins -- and dead even in one. I think there's no question the Republican open seats -- Nevada, Maryland -- are going to be very, very tough battles, but we have some outstanding candidates there, and I think we have some chances there.

WOODRUFF: Do you two agree on the seats the Democrats have got to hang onto?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Sure. Start with all the incumbents.

Mr. ROLLINS: First of all, I think one of the great disappointments to us is that there aren't more Democratic incumbents who are up this time, and certainly those who are are in pretty good shape. There's not a Democratic incumbent behind today, which is unfortunate.

WOODRUFF: Is there --

Mr. O'DONNELL: That's your point of view.

WOODRUFF: What was that? I missed that.

Mr. O'DONNELL: He says it's unfortunate.

WOODRUFF: Is there an overriding national issue or issues that will affect most or many of these races?

Mr. ROLLINS: To date there is not a national issue. In eight weeks, nine weeks, a lot can occur. I think the key concern of most Republicans is if the economy is perceived as going into a stale period and the Democrats can make that an issue -- that we're going to go back into recession, even though we're not -- that may have an effect on one or two percentage points. And really all you're talking about is a change in the environment of one or two percentage points, and quite a few seats could go down.

2022875265

LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®] LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®]



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

WOODRUFF: Do you buy that, Kirk?

Mr. O'DONNELL: Clearly, the Democrats are trying to focus and regionalize, at least in those states -- maybe 31 states -- that are suffering from sluggish economy at the moment a message. And the theme being that you don't need more of the same. You don't need someone who's going to come to Washington and follow the leader. This is an effort that has just begun over the last couple of weeks, and I think it will be critical to Democratic success in November.

WOODRUFF: Do you -- is that a smart --

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, it's certainly -- it's a good strategy, but I'm not sure it's a strategy that will work. You take one of the most heavily economically stressed areas of the farm community of this country. Someone like Bob Dole, someone like Chuck Grassley have been extremely effective spokespersons for their point of view and have differed with the President sometimes on agricultural issues, and I think are going to win overwhelmingly. So I don't think in every area it's going to work.

WOODRUFF: But in some.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Clearly, it's a major factor in North Dakota, and it's a major factor, obviously, in South Dakota. And it can be a factor throughout all the farm states. I would like to make the point that Ed Rollins did a terrific job in 1984 in putting forward a national theme -- that it was morning in America. In 1982, the Republicans had a clear national theme -- stay the course. In 1980, they had a strong theme, which was vote Republican for a change. I think in 1986, running theme-less, they've given advantage to the Democrats, because Democratic strength is, by definition, local strength in this country. And their inability to come forward with a theme is a serious deficiency in this election year.

WOODRUFF: Are the Republicans running theme-less, Ed Rollins?

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, I think the President's agenda clearly is the theme that most Republicans are running on across the country. But I think the advantage is --

WOODRUFF: Well, wait a minute. Let me stop you there. Is that a plus or a minus?

Mr. ROLLINS: I think it's a plus in the sense that the President still holds very high popularity numbers. Traditionally, in the sixth year, an incumbent President usually is a drag on the ticket -- a drag on the ticket. This President is very popular, and I think that his ability to raise money and his ability to campaign -- he will probably save one or two incumbent senators by his last minute visits this year, and I think that's very important.

Mr. O'DONNELL: His personal popularity is not a theme, though. He's --

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, his programs are, and I think --

Mr. O'DONNELL: Well, but his -- the situation he has at the moment is that he's seeking bipartisan support for his revenue program, which is tax reform. You have bipartisan cooperation in Congress on spending. So the refrain that

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®

2022875266



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

you've heard for years, which is an effective refrain -- tax and spend -- is not available to him as he travels around the country this time.

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, I think there's no question, Kirk, if the Speaker and you were still setting the agenda, we'd still be spending more and taxing more. But I think the key thing is that the President's popularity has got the Republican pool of support higher than it's ever been before. And I think it becomes very, very important that he mobilize voters. And I think the key to this election is going to be what kind of turnout is there? Is there any great enthusiasm on the part of your voters or our voters? And if there is not, then who knows what's going to happen?

WOODRUFF: Is he going to go around and help every single Republican senator?

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, he can't possibly help every Republican senator, but he is

WOODRUFF: Well, I mean the ones who are in tough races.

Mr. ROLLINS: There's no question. He already has. He has done more than any president in modern history. In '82 he had done more. He exceeded that in early '85. '86 he's already surpassed that. So I think there's no question he's going to go to the maximum.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Well, he did it in '82 in North Carolina, and it didn't have

Mr. ROLLINS: Did it in Nevada in '82, and --

Mr. O'DONNELL: -- the sort of effect he'd like. And he won 377 House districts in the campaign that you managed in 1984. And he had virtually no coattails. So as long as he's going out and personalizing it, as he has in his speeches so far, I think he's missing the boat.

Mr. ROLLINS: Well, I don't think he's -- I think that he clearly is going to help some incumbents, and that's the key factor. He has raised -- one of the advantages that certainly is going to make a difference is the fund-raising ability of the President, and he went out and raised a million and a half dollars for Ed Zschau the other day, put some momentum in his campaign, raised \$800,000 for Ken Kramer yesterday. That certainly is going to have an effect.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Sure does.

WOODRUFF: You don't dispute that. What about --

Mr. O'DONNELL: I would make a point -- that that fund raising isn't going into generic advertising by the Republican party to put forward a theme in this campaign.

WOODRUFF: Generic -- you mean national.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Right.

WOODRUFF: What about -- a couple of people have -- it's been written recently that this anti-drug effort that's underway, both on the part of the Democrats

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875267



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

and the Republicans, may turn out to be an issue. Do you -- either one of you think it will?

Mr. ROLLINS: There's a tremendous concern among the American public among drugs. I think both Democrats and Republicans are out there advocating tough drug programs, and so I don't think, unless an incumbent member of Congress or challenger has a record of weakness somewhere and supported legalizing marijuana or not tough on drug enforcement, will it be an advantage to anyone.

WOODRUFF: You go along with that?

Mr. O'DONNELL: I think it will be local. And I think, again, this is another example of how differences are not being defined between Republicans and Democrats -- namely, that this is a bipartisan approach that Congress is taking, and therefore doesn't lend itself to a national theme.

WOODRUFF: And you're saying neither side really helps in that.

Mr. ROLLINS: We feel bipartisanship works much better if we have a Republican Senate.

Mr. O'DONNELL: We like it with a --

WOODRUFF: Ed -- we know what you were going to say. Ed Rollins, Kirk O'Donnell, thank you both for being with us.

Mr. O'DONNELL: Thank you very much.

Fumes at Work

LEHRER: Finally tonight, a report on the ongoing battle between smokers and nonsmokers. It's over turf -- specifically, efforts to ban smoking in the workplace. One sharply fought battleground is in the state of Washington. Lee Hochberg of public station KCTS, Seattle, has more.

LEE HOCHBERG (voice-over): On an average workday in Seattle, white collar workers cluster on the sidewalk, forced out of their offices to light up -- outside insurance companies and hospitals and television stations.

Smoker: I don't mind. It's cut down my smoking.

HOCHBERG: It has cut down your smoking.

Smoker: Cut it in half.

Smoker: I don't think it's a very professional look for the company to have people huddled around smoking outside. I think it's very juvenile, actually. Reminiscent of high school days.

HOCHBERG: What if they forced you outside to smoke?

Smoker: Somehow or another, that never has seemed to me to be constitutional. It's a legal activity. It's not illegal.

2022875268

LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®] LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®]



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

HOCHBERG (voice-over): That's the position of the tobacco industry, as suggested by a spokeswoman on a recent Seattle television program.

(clip from NightSight)

ANN BROWDER, The Tobacco Institute: We're saying it's a legal and lawful product, and anyone who chooses to use the product should be able to use the product. That's all that we're saying. We're saying that there should be efforts within the workplace, consideration given to the smokers as well as the nonsmokers. And that's a situation that should be worked out within the individual workplace. We don't think that there should be any type of uniform law restricting the use of tobacco products.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): But legal experts say companies are within their rights to force cigarette smokers outdoors. The constitution prevents states from acting in certain ways, but not private employers.

CORNELIUS PECK, University of Washington: We all admire those wonderful, free spirits who feel so good and happy when they work that they love to whistle while they work, but if the employer decides that that interferes too much with the production in the plant, the employer most certainly may say, "There's no whistling while you work in this plant." They say the same thing about smoking.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): With the law on their side, hundreds of Seattle companies have snuffed out smoking. The Northwest's largest employer, the Boeing Aerospace Company, is gradually imposing a total ban on smoking for its 112,000 workers. At the Seattle Times news room, cigarettes, cigars, pipes have been prohibited ever since these two reporters pushed for a no smoking policy two years ago. They say they were fed up with their colleagues who refused to use desk-top air purifiers provided by the management.

CAROL OSTROM, Seattle Times: You know, I don't want to work -- have to be sick in order to work. I don't think the Times wants me to have to be sick to work either.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): The Times say there's no indoor space with adequate ventilation to serve as a smokers lounge. So now Times journalists who smoke have to find another way to work off news room tension, like chewing gum. Or they have to find their way to the fire escape. Here, accompanied by the whir and whine of motors and air compressors, they can enjoy a quick smoke. And smoking on the fire escape can mean braving rain, snow and wind.

RICK RAPHAEL, Seattle Times: In the winter, this is really rough out here. The only salvation for us is this. This is exhaust, and it gets warm, radiates heat, so we stay warm out here.

HOCHBERG: So you huddle close to the chimney here.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Oh, yeah. It's funny. It's really funny, you know. You get out here, and there will be five or six people out here smoking cigarettes, and they're jockeying for space up against the wall to stay warm.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): But, even banished to the fire escape, some smokers see a positive result.

2022875269

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

Mr. RAPHAEL: I was smoking two packs of cigarettes a day when I got here. I'm smoking about a pack of cigarettes a day now.

HOCHBERG: So it's helped.

Mr. RAPHAEL: Oh, it's helped. Yeah.

RICK ANDERSON, Seattle Times: Every step like this reduces the attractiveness, the attraction of smoking. Every step like this adds to the sort of psychic costs of the habit.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): By discouraging employees from smoking, the Seattle Times says it's saving on health care costs, though it doesn't yet know how much. Its smoking policy does help it retain its preferred status on property casualty insurance, and that saves the paper upwards of \$200,000 a year.

Therapist: How bad is it?

Smoker: It's awful. Disgusting.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): The benefits to employers are so great that many of them are spending thousands of dollars to help their employees kick the habit. They're employing the whole gamut of treatment programs: hypnosis, psychoanalysis and, here at the Schick Center in Seattle, aversion therapy. In this program, a smoker is shut into a dirty, smoky, little booth. Electrodes clipped to an arm deliver electric shocks as the smoker is required to quick-puff cigarettes until her mouth is uncomfortably hot. It's all intended to associate smoking with unpleasant sensations, so the smoking employee loses the craving to smoke.

Therapist: Is the impulse on your arm strong enough? Is it irritating?

Smoker: I probably could use it a little higher.

Therapist: Okay.

HOCHBERG (voice-over): More than 20 companies around Seattle are putting employees through the program at \$345 per person. In just one year, corporations have paid Schick \$130,000 to get their employees off smoking. And, bizarre as the treatment may be, Schick says more and more employees are lining up to take it. That may be the most surprising part of this anti-smoking trend -- how willing smokers have been to accept the no smoking policies; indeed, to take advantage of them to help them break the habit. It's an attitude that makes anti-smoking crusaders like Bill Weiss and Bob Rosner confident that smoke-free workplaces will soon be the rule; not the exception.

BILL WEISS, Smoking Policy Institute: The notion that there are a bunch of militant, you know, fist-pounding smokers out there screaming rights issues is a fallacious notion. That simply is not the case.

BOB ROSNER, Smoking Policy Institute: This is something that people are going to have to get used to -- that the ashtray in the corporate environment is going to be as rare as the spittoon is. Smoking is on its way out.

2022875270

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS



(c) 1986 EBC & GWETA. All Rights Reserved, September 9, 1986

HUNTER-GAULT: Again, today's top news stories. Another American, 53 year old Frank Reed, the director of a small, private school in Beirut, has been kidnapped. It brings to five the number of Americans believed held by the Islamic Jihad, or Holy War. A Soviet physicist working for the United Nations was formally indicted in spying charges by a grand jury in New York. And the American correspondent in Moscow apparently being held in retaliation on similar spy charges told his wife he fears Soviet-American tensions are escalating dangerously. Good night, Jim.

LEHRER: Good night, Charlayne. We'll see you tomorrow night. I'm Jim Lehrer. Thank you and good night.

2022875271

LEXIS® NEXIS® LEXIS® NEXIS®